Draft version September 5, 2016
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 01/23/15

arXiv:1609.00707v1 [astro-ph.EP] 2 Sep 2016

GEOMAGNETIC PROPERTIES OF PROXIMA CENTAURI B ANALOGUES

Jorge I. Zuluaga[1]
Solar, Earth and Planetary Physics Group & Computational Physics and Astrophysics Group (FACom)
Instituto de Física - FCEN, Universidad de Antioquia, Calle 67 No. 53-108, Medellín, Colombia

and

Sebastian Bustamante [2]
Heidelberg Institute für Theoretische Studien
Schloss-Wolfsbrunnenweg 35, 69118 Heidelberg, Germany

Draft version September 5, 2016

ABSTRACT

The recent discovery of a planet around the closest star, Proxima Centauri, could represent a quantum leap on the testability of models in exoplanet sciences. Unlike any other discovered exoplanet, models of planetary processes in Proxima b could be contrasted against near future telescopic observations and far future in-situ measurements. In this paper we study the geomagnetic properties of Proxima banalogues, namely, solid planets with masses close but larger than Earth's mass, periods of rotation of several days and habitable surface conditions. Assuming different planetary masses, bulk compositions and periods of rotations, we calculate for each planetary analogue its radius, heat flux, time of inner core formation, dynamo lifetime and minimum dipole magnetic moment. We find that most ($\gtrsim$70%) Proxima b analogues develop intrinsic dynamos that last at least 3 Gyr, although only half of them are older than the present age of the host star ($4-6$ Gyr). Relying in our planetary evolution models, we predict with a 70% confidence level that Proxima b will be an earth-like planet with mass and radius $1.3 \leq M_{\rm p} \leq 2.3\,M_{\oplus}$, $R_{\rm p} = 1.4^{+0.3}_{-0.2}\,R_{\oplus}$, having today an intrinsic dynamo with a dipole moment $\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip} = 0.32^{\times 2.3}_{\div 2.9}\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip,\oplus}$. Our results rely on the assumptions of flat priors in the input parameters, small orbital eccentricity, negligible tidal heating and earth-like radiogenic mantle elements abundances. The same results obtained for this set of planetary analogues, apply to other earth-like planets having similar observed properties than Proxima b(minimum mass, orbital period and stellar mass).

Subject headings: Planets and satellites: magnetic fields — Planets and satellites: fundamental parameters — Planets and satellites: individual (Proxima Centauri b)

1. INTRODUCTION

After 16 year of observations, the first planet around the closest M-dwarf, Proxima Centauri or Proxima, has been finally discovered (Anglada-Escudé et al. 2016). The reported properties of the planet, a minimum mass of $1.3M_{\oplus}$ and orbital period about 11.3 days, which places it inside the habitable zone (HZ), make of Proxima b the closest Earth-twin.

Beyond its obvious astrobiological relevance (Barnes et al. 2016; Ribas et al. 2016; Turbet et al. 2016), future observations of Proxima b with ground- and space-based telescopes (E-ELT, TMT, JWST, WFIRST, HDST, etc.) and, hopefully, in-situ space probes (Lubin 2016), will provide us evidences supporting or contradicting models of planetary processes not yet tested beyond the Solar System.

Here we apply planetary evolution models we developed in Zuluaga et al. (2013), to study the geomagnetic properties of Proxima b analogues, namely planets with masses between 1.3 and $\sim 2.6M_{\oplus}$, rotational periods between 7.5 and 11.3 days, and habitable surface conditions.

Our aim is not only to contribute with the understanding of the newly-discovered exoplanet, but also to perform predictions about its properties that could be contrasted in the future with actual observations. But our results are not restricted to Proxima b. The same set of planetary analogues we model here, describe well other earth-like exoplanets with similar observable properties (planetary minimum mass, orbital period and stellar mass).

This letter is organized as follows: in Section 2 we summarize the planetary evolution model. Section 3 describe the methods we use to generate the set of Proxima b analogues. Section 4 presents analysis and specific predictions about the geomagnetic properties of Proxima b. Finally, in Section 5 we discuss our results and their limitations.

2. PLANETARY EVOLUTION MODEL

The planetary evolution model (interior structure, thermal and core-dynamo evolution) used here is based in that developed and tested in Zuluaga et al. (2013). We summarize here the key features of the model without the mathematical details, that can be be found in Section 3 of the aforementioned paper.

Our Proxima b analogues are solid spherical planets, with (in general) three differentiated layers (Figure 1): an iron core, a rocky mantle and a surface layer of water ice. Our original model did not include the latter. However, since in-situ formation of planets with the mass

[1] jorge.zuluaga@udea.edu.co
[2] sebastian.bustamante@h-its.org



FIG. 1.— Schematic representation of our planetary model. $\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip}$ is the magnetic dipole moment. $Q_{\rm c}$ the heat coming out from the core and $Q_{\rm m}$ the total heat released by the planet.

of Proxima b around a $\sim$0.1 $M_\odot$ star, seems to be implausible (Anglada-Escudé et al. 2016), several alternative formation scenarios considered so far (Ribas et al. 2016; Barnes et al. 2016) predict that Proxima b could be a volatile-rich (ocean) planet (Léger et al. 2004).

Pressure, density, gravitational field and local bulk modulus inside the planet, are calculated solving the hydrostatic equilibrium, continuity and Adams-Williamson equations (Valencia et al. 2006, 2007a,b). For all layers we use the Vinet equation-of-state with parameters frequently used in literature (see Table 1 in Zuluaga et al. 2013). We assume in all cases that the core is made of pure iron (solid inner-core) and an iron alloy, namely $Fe_{(0.8)}FeS_{(0.2)}$ (liquid outer-core). The rocky mantle is made of olivine (upper mantle) and perovskite with ferromagnesiowustite (lower mantle). The outer water layer (if present) is made of ice VII (the solid phase of water that exist in the largest range of temperatures and pressures) close to its melting conditions.

Once the interior structure equations are solved for a given bulk composition, mass and initial temperature profile, the interior mechanical properties (density and pressure) remain the same during the integration of the thermal evolution model.

In all our models the iron core starts completely liquid. As the core cools the central temperature could reach the solidus and a solid inner core starts to grow. We call this, the time of inner core formation, $t_{\rm ic}$. Solidification releases latent heat and dissolved volatiles boosting convection in the outer core and hence the dynamo action.

Coupled equations describing heat transport, evolution of the inner core radius and total heat and entropy released, are solved to give us the core energy budget as a function of time (Eqs. 7-12 in Zuluaga et al. 2013).

Dynamo action in the core lasts while convection dominates the flux of energy. Once convection becomes negligible, the dynamo shuts down. We call the time while a planetary magnetic field is dynamo generated, the dynamo lifetime $t_{\rm dyn}$.

Heat transport in the mantle is modeled by conduction at the core-mantle and mantle-ice boundaries (stagnant lid regime), and by convection in the lower and upper mantle (mobile lids). A constant supply of radiogenic energy is also present in the mantle of all our planets. The abundances and isotopic composition are assumed to be similar to that of Earth.

Mantle rheology is modeled using two different viscosity models: one for large pressures (lower mantle) and other for low pressures (upper mantle). This one of the novel features of our thermal evolution model. It fits very well the structure and global thermal evolution properties of the Earth and is better suited for modeling more massive planets where large pressures at the bottom of the mantle could be customary (Zuluaga et al. 2013).

Once we have solved the equations governing the coupled core and mantle thermal evolution, we estimate the global properties of the magnetic field generated by dynamo action at the liquid outer core. For that purpose we use well-known energy-based scaling laws (Christensen 2010) which relate the total energy and entropy available involved in convection, with the volumetric energy density of the magnetic field. This energy could be distributed in many multipolar components (multipolar-dominated field) or be concentrated in the dipole component (dipolar-dominated field; eg. Earth's magnetic field). One key factor determining the magnetic regime is the rotational period of the planet. We use here the prescription proposed by Zuluaga & Cuartas (2012) to calculate in each case the maximum dipole moment.

After solving both, the interior structure and thermal evolution model, we calculate for each planetary analogue, six key properties: (1) planetary radius $R_{\rm p}$, (2) time-averaged surface heat flux $Q_{\rm m}$, (3) time of inner core formation $t_{\rm ic}$, (4) dynamo lifetime $t_{\rm dyn}$, (5) minimum and (6) maximum dipole moment, $\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip}^{\rm min}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip}^{\rm max}$ respectively. We call them the "geomagnetic properties" of the planet.

3. Proxima b ANALOGUES

Only two properties of Proxima b are presently known: its minimum mass $M_{\rm min} = M_{\rm p} \sin i = 1.3 M_\oplus$ and orbital period $P_{\rm orb} = 11.3$ days(Anglada-Escudé et al. 2016). Other key physical properties such as its mass $M_{\rm p}$, bulk composition (core, ice and mantle mass-fractions, CMF, IMF and MMF respectively), planetary radius $R_{\rm p}$, rotational period $P_{\rm rot}$, orbital inclination i relative to the plane of the sky ($i = 0°$ for a face-on orbit) and eccentricity e are yet unknown.

Still, if we build an ensemble of planetary analogues, drawing random values (with proper prior distributions) of some of the unknown properties, we can calculate posterior probability distribution of the geomagnetic properties of the ensemble, and predict their expected values at a given confidence level.

For that purpose we first build a grid of planetary models with masses ranging from 1 to 7 $M_\oplus$ (resolution of 0.3-0.5$M_\oplus$). This set of masses not only include the minimum mass of Proxima b, but cover a large range of orbital inclinations, namely $i \gtrsim 10°$. Though inclinations below 10° ($M_{\rm p} > 7\,M_\oplus$) are possible, a planet with a such a large mass would produce detectable astrometric signals in Proxima Centauri (Barnes et al. 2016). Since

those signals have not been detected we discard those inclinations.

For each mass our codes are run for CMF ranging from 0.1 to 0.8 (0.1 steps) and IMF ranging from 0.0 to 0.9-CMF. Pure iron, rocky or ice analogues were not calculated, since our model requires that at least a mantle and a core exist.

Our planetary grid includes 1,100 different combinations of mass and compositions enclosing not only the properties of Proxima b, but also the properties of many other discovered and yet to be discovered earth-like exoplanets.

To build our ensemble of Proxima b analogues only three of the unknown properties, inclination i, rotational period $P_{\rm rot}$ and bulk composition (CMF,IMF,MMF) were randomly generated. Planetary mass and radius, which are also unknown, depend on these three properties. In all cases eccentricity was assumed close to 0 (see Section 5 for a discussion).

Inclinations are generated assuming a flat prior in the interval $i \in [10°, 90°]$. With the minimum mass of Proxima b and even accepting very low inclinations, more than 85% of the analogues would have masses below our model maximum of $7M_\oplus$.

Composition vector (CMF,IMF,CMF) is generated in such a way that every possible combination in our model grid are equally probable (flat composition prior).

The period of rotation is a key quantity at determining the geomagnetic properties. Since the planet is close to its hots star (semi-major axis $a = 0.05AU$), its period of rotation should be in a resonance with its orbital period (Makarov & Efroimsky 2013). The most obvious is the 1:1 resonance (synchronous rotation). However, even if the orbital eccentricity is small, it could be trapped in a supersynchronous resonance, ie. 3:2, 2:1, etc. (Makarov 2013; Makarov & Efroimsky 2013; Ribas et al. 2016). The probability of being trapped in those rotational states depends not only on eccentricity, but also on triaxiality (Ribas et al. 2016), bulk composition (Cuartas-Restrepo et al. 2016) and detailed rheological properties (Makarov 2013). In the absence of any knowledge about these uncertain parameters, we will assume that Proxima b analogues could have, with equal probability, one of two rotational periods: 11.3 days (synchronous rotation), and 7.5 days (3:2 resonance).

4. RESULTS

4.1. *The nominal analogues*

It is customary to assume that Proxima b has a mass equal to the minimum mass and a synchronous rotation. We call planets with these properties the "nominal analogues". In Figure 2 we show contour plots in ternary diagrams of the 6 key geomagnetic propertiesof these analogues.

The nominal Proxima b analogues have radii in the range $0.96 - 1.53R_\oplus$ with a median value of 1.24 $R_\oplus$ (see top-left panel of Figure 2); more precisely,

$$R_{\rm p}^{\rm nom} = 1.24 \pm 0.14 R_\oplus$$

.

Lines of equal radius in the corresponding contour plot almost match the lines of equal IMF of the ternary diagram. This implies that most of the uncertainty in radius comes from an uncertainty in the mass fraction of volatiles. If for instance we assume a negligible IMF the radius of the nominal analogues is better constrained:

$$R_{\rm p}^{\rm nom,dry} = 1.04 \pm 0.06 R_\oplus$$

We identify a "sweet-spot" in the composition space, namely nominal analogues having CMF≈0.6, IMF≈0.15 and MMF≈0.35. This "iron-rich" ocean analogues, develop the most intense magnetic fields, have long-lived dynamos, and their solid inner-cores arise in few Gyrs. Despite having a rotational rate ∼10 times slower than Earth, this nominal analogues magnetically alike to Earth.

Interestingly, for most compositions, Proxima b nominal analoguess have dynamo lifetimes larger than planetary age, $\tau_\star = 4.8 \pm 1$ Gyr (Bazot et al. 2016; Barnes et al. 2016; Thévenin et al. 2002; Thoul et al. 2003). Only for 10% of the compositions (eg. IMF≈0, CMF=MMF≈ 0.5), the dynamo has been already been shut down or it is disappearing.

The minimum and maximum dipole moment do not differ significantly for most compositions. Therefore, we can use only one of them (the minimum) to characterize the typical magnetic field strength. According to our models the nominal analogues has:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip}^{\rm nom} = 0.19^{+0.15}_{-0.11} \mathcal{M}_{\rm dip,\oplus}$$

or equivalently

$$B_{\rm dip}^{\rm nom} = 4.52 \pm 0.3 \mu{\rm T}$$

which is consistent with the results in Figure 4 of Zuluaga et al. (2013).

4.2. *Posterior distribution of geomagnetic properties*

Although, when modeling complex planetary properties it is customary to assume that the mass of the planet is equal to the measured minimum mass (nominal case) it is very important to recall that the actual planet could have masses several times larger than this. In the case of Proxima b it is not unlikely that instead of having an earth-like planet we could be in the presence of a super-Earth.

In order to understand the distribution of geomagnetic properties in planetary analogues with different masses, we generate ∼5,000 planets having random compositions, random orbital inclinations and two possible periods of rotations. In Figure 3 we show in a mass-radius diagram, the global properties of the sample and schematically represent the properties of 100 random planetary analogues. We only show in that figure planets with masses smaller than $2.6M_\oplus$ that represent ∼80% of the full sample (see cumulative distribution function in the top inset panel).

We conclude that provided uniform priors for composition, orbital inclination and period of rotation, the planetary radius of Proxima b analogues will be:

$$R_{\rm p} = 1.38^{+0.26}_{-0.19} R_\oplus$$

If we exclude from the sample, planets having significant amount of volatiles (IMF>0.3), the posterior distribution gives us a slightly lower radius



FIG. 2.— Ternary diagrams of 6 key geomagnetic propertiesfor nominal Proxima b analoguesEach point in the diagrams correspond to a single composition: CMF, IMF and CMF. Planets with equal MMF lies on horizontal lines. Planets with equal CMF and IMF lies on diagonal lines parallel to the left and right sides of the triangles, respectively. Gray areas correspond to nearly core-less or mantle-less objects where no planetary model were calculated.

$$R_{\rm p}^{\rm IMF\leq 0.3} = 1.27^{+0.24}_{-0.13} R_\oplus$$

A similar analysis was performed in the case of representative geomagnetic properties: dynamo lifetime, time of inner-core formation, and minimum dipole moment. Results are shown in Figure 4.

As for the nominal analogues planets in the full set have systematically long-lived dynamos. More interestingly, for the case of Proxima b, most ($\gtrsim 60-70\%$) of the analogues have dynamo lifetime $\gtrsim \tau_\star$. This is only true, however if we include planets of any composition in the analysis. If we restrict to analogues with low to moderate volatile inventories, IMF≤0.3, the median dynamo life-time is decreased, leaving almost equal fractions of planet with an active and a defunct dynamo at present times.

A similar but complimentary result is obtained in the case of the time of inner-core formation. Most Proxima b analogues develop an inner core in a time $\lesssim \tau_\star$. This is true, both when all possible compositions are considered and when volatile rich planets are excluded.

We find that a non-negligible fraction of analogues, mostly iron-rich planets with masses larger than $2M_\oplus$, despite of having large rotational periods, have magnetic fields as intense or even stronger than Earth. Comparing dynamo life-time and magnetic dipole moment panels, however, let us to realize that those planets having the stronger fields are also the ones with shorter-lived dynamos. It is also interesting to notice that the posterior distribution of dipole moments is not modified significantly when we exclude volatile rich planets. This would imply that for the sake of estimating sample average magnetic field strength, composition is not as important as in the case of other geomagnetic properties.

We predict that the minimum dipole moment for Proxima b analogues is:

$$\log(\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip}/\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip,\oplus}) = -0.49^{+0.36}_{-0.47}$$

,

or equivalently:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rm dip} = 0.32^{\times 2.3}_{\div 2.9} \mathcal{M}_{\rm dip,\oplus}$$

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results presented in this paper rely on relatively robust models of planetary interior structure, thermal evolution and dynamo scaling laws. These models have been tested against two well-known objects: the Earth and Venus. The discovery of Proxima b is an unique opportunity to compare the predictions of these models with an exoplanet that could be observed with unprecedented detail in the near future and, hopefully, reached by space probes in the coming centuries.

Other models of planetary thermal and magnetic evolution have appeared in literature since Zuluaga et al. (2013). Of particular relevance is the recent model by Driscoll & Barnes (2015) that includes the effects of tidal heating. If tidal heating is negligible (which is the case for a close-in low eccentric planet trapped in synchronous rotation), the underlying physics of both models is quite similar; their results will not differ more than discrepancies arising from the very uncertain physical parameters on which both models depends.

If future observations confirm the existence of another planet in the system, as it was suggested by Anglada-Escudé et al. (2016), or are able to measure a non negligible orbital eccentricity ($e > 0.06$) we will need to update these results by including the effects of tidal heating. Meanwhile, however, including these effects (that require at least another 2 or 3 unknown input free parameters) would just reduce the robustness of our predictions.

Papers published so far about Proxima b (Ribas et al. 2016; Barnes et al. 2016; Coleman et al. 2016; Turbet et al. 2016) have focus on modeling a lot of detailed properties of a planet with 1.3 $M_\oplus$ having compositions similar to that of Earth. While this paper has not been as ambitious and exhaustive as those other works, we have approached to the problem in a fundamentally different way. We built a grid of planetary models, having a large range of masses and compositions, and calculated posterior probability distributions of a few key properties.

Although the statistical significance of Proxima b discovery is impressive (FAP$\sim 10^{-7}$, $B_1/B_0 \sim 10^7$, Anglada-Escudé et al. 2016) we should still seek for an independent confirmation. Even in the very unlikely case that the signal of Proxima b have another origin (see a recent example in Anglada-Escudé & Tuomi 2015; Hatzes 2016), our results are still valid for confirmed planets having similar basic properties (minimum mass, orbital period and stellar mass).

Our models have several important caveats that could make their numerical predictions biased or simply wrong. We have completely neglected orbital eccentricity. Although Anglada-Escudé et al. (2016) observations are compatible with eccentricities as large as 0.35, it does not directly suggest that the planet has an eccentric orbit. Still the dynamics of the triple system or the stellar stream to which the host star belongs, suggest that past perturbations could have excited a non-zero eccentricity (Barnes et al. 2016). The presence of another super-Earth in the system is neither confirmed nor discarded by observations. If a second planet exist, the orbit of Proxima b could be perturbed and have an oscillating non-negligible eccentricity. We assumed that the abundance of key radionuclides, such Th-232, U-238 and K-40, in the mantle of all our planetary analogues is identical to that of Earth. However, it has been shown the abundance of Eu (a proxy for r-process elements such as Th and U) in the atmosphere of α Cen A is lower than that of the Sun (Hinkel & Kane 2013), suggesting that Proxima b could have also a lower content of heavy radionuclides. On the other hand, volatile-rich analogues of Proxima b could also have larger contents of K-40 (a volatile element), provided they form beyond the snow-line. The effect of a larger radiogenic inventory has been studied by Barnes et al. (2016) (only in the case of planets having the minimum mass). Larger radionuclides abundances delay the solidification of an inner core but increase the core convective power. In our case if the abundance of Th and U is relatively low, the predicted magnetic field strength will be slightly lower. However, if our ocean planets have a significant abundance of K-40, they could lack entirely of a dynamo. It should be recalled, how-



FIG. 3.— Mass-radius distribution, cumulative marginal distribution of planetary mass (top inset) and marginal posterior distribution of planetary radii (right panel) for Proxima b analoguesNumber density of planetary analogues in the mass-radius diagram is represented by the background contour plot. For illustration purposes we show 100 random planets as layered circles. The radius of each circle is proportional to the planetary radius. The radius of the color are proportional to mass-fractions: iron core (red), rocky mantle (yellow) and ice crust (blue). Periods of rotation are represented with a vertical (1:1 resonance) or a horizontal (3:2 resonance) "radius".

ever, that if we subtract volatile rich planets from our averaging, the posterior distribution will not be modified significantly.

We have used NASAs ADS Bibliographic Services. Most of the computations that made possible this work were performed with `Python 2.7` and their related tools and libraries, `iPython` (Pérez & Granger 2007), `Matplotlib` (Hunter et al. 2007), `scipy` and `numpy` (Van Der Walt et al. 2011). This work is supported by Vicerrectoria de Docencia-UdeA and the *Estrategia de Sostenibilidad 2014-2015 de la Universidad de Antioquia*. SB acknowledges support from the International Max-Planck Research School for Astronomy and Cosmic Physics at the University of Heidelberg (IMPRS-HD) and financial support the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) through the program Research Grants - Doctoral Programmes in Germany (57129429).

REFERENCES

Anglada-Escudé, G., & Tuomi, M. 2015, Science, 347, 1080
Anglada-Escudé, G., Amado, P. J., Barnes, J., et al. 2016, Nature, 536, 437
Barnes, R., Deitrick, R., Luger, R., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints
Bazot, M., Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., Gizon, L., & Benomar, O. 2016, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 460, 1254
Christensen, U. R. 2010, Space Sci. Rev., 152, 565
Coleman, G. A. L., Nelson, R. P., Paardekooper, S.-J., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints
Cuartas-Restrepo, P., Melita, M., Zuluaga, J., et al. 2016, arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.07546
Driscoll, P., & Barnes, R. 2015, Astrobiology, 15, 739
Hatzes, A. P. 2016, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 585, A144
Hinkel, N. R., & Kane, S. R. 2013, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters, slt032
Hunter, J. D., et al. 2007, Computing in science and engineering, 9, 90
Léger, A., Selsis, F., Sotin, C., et al. 2004, Icarus, 169, 499
Lubin, P. 2016, arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.01356
Makarov, V. V. 2013, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters, slt068
Makarov, V. V., & Efroimsky, M. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 764, 27
Pérez, F., & Granger, B. E. 2007, Computing in Science & Engineering, 9, 21
Ribas, I., Bolmont, E., Selsis, F., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints



FIG. 4.— Distributions of three key geomagnetic properties for Proxima b analogues: dynamo lifetime (upper panel), time of inner-core formation (middle panel) and minimum dipole moment (bottom panel). In the case of dynamo lifetime and time of inner-core formation we plot cumulative posterior distributions including the full set of planetary analogues (continuous blue line) and a sub sample including only planets with IMF$\leq$0.3.

Thévenin, F., Provost, J., Morel, P., et al. 2002, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 392, L9
Thoul, A., Scuflaire, R., Noels, A., et al. 2003, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 402, 293
Turbet, M., Leconte, J., Selsis, F., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints
Valencia, D., O'Connell, R. J., & Sasselov, D. 2006, Icarus, 181, 545
Valencia, D., Sasselov, D. D., & O'Connell, R. J. 2007a, ApJ, 665, 1413
—. 2007b, ApJ, 656, 545
Van Der Walt, S., Colbert, S. C., & Varoquaux, G. 2011, Computing in Science & Engineering, 13, 22
Zuluaga, J. I., Bustamante, S., Cuartas, P. A., & Hoyos, J. H. 2013, ApJ, 770, 23
Zuluaga, J. I., & Cuartas, P. A. 2012, Icarus, 217, 88